F. M. S. REPORTS.

PUBLIC PROSECUTOR vs. MUSA BIN JAMAL.

[App. Crim. Juris. (Cussen, J.) November 11, 1940]

Road Traffic Enactment (No. 17 of 1937), section 80 (i) — No licence to use motor vehicle as stage carriage — Liability of driver.

The facts sufficiently appear from the judgment.

Held, as regards the first charge that section 80 (i) of the Road Traffic Enactment has no application to the driver of a motor vehicle as such, but is confined in its application to the person who holds or should hold a licence for the motor vehicle.

T. T. Russell, Deputy Public Prosecutor, for Appellant.

Respondent in person.

Cussen, J. : — This is an appeal by the Public Prosecutor against the decision of the Magistrate, Krian, in Krian Summons Cases Nos. 193 to 195 of 1940.

The accused in those cases was charged with three offences.

(1) That you on or about 10.35 a.m. 27th April, 1940, at Bagan Serai did cause a motor vehicle identification No. PK 7081 to be used as a stage carriage vehicle without being the holder of a licence to use it as a vehicle of that class in accordance with the provisions of Part IV R.T.E. 1937 and you have thereby committed an offence under section 80 (1) and 80 (6) punishable under section 118 (1) R.T.E. 1937.

The learned Magistrate discharged the accused on all three charges.

The petition of appeal states :—

"Your petitioner is dissatisfied with the said order on the grounds following :—

(a) The Magistrate misdirected himself in law in not applying to charge No. 1 the presumptions set forth in section 113 (2) of the Road Traffic Enactment.

(b) The Magistrate misdirected himself in law in not applying to charge No. 2 the provisions of section 12 (5) of the Road Traffic Enactment."

At the end of the evidence for the prosecution, the learned Magistrate discharged the accused without calling upon him for any defence.

The accused was the driver of the motor vehicle in question. He was not the owner.

Section 80 (1) on which the first charge is laid reads as follows :—

No person shall cause or permit a motor vehicle to be used as a state carriage a contract carriage or a hackney carriage unless he is the holder of a licence (in this Enactment referred to as 'a public service vehicle licence') to use it as a vehicle of that class in accordance with the provisions of this Part.

Now, in my opinion, apart from any question of the presumption under section 113 (2) of the Road Traffic Enactment, referred to in the grounds of appeal, this section 80 (1) cannot in any case apply to the driver of a motor vehicle *qua* driver, for the driver as such is not the holder of the licence, of whatever kind, in respect of the motor vehicle, that licence is always in the name of the owner or of some person representing the owner in that respect. It is quite clear that if the driver merely as driver comes under this section, then any driver-employee, not being the holder of the licence for the car he is driving, commits an offence under this section.

I conclude therefore that section 80 (1) has no application to the driver of a motor vehicle as such but is confined in its application to the person who holds or should hold a licence for the motor vehicle.

Apart, therefore, from any consideration of section 113 (2) of the Enactment, I conclude that the decision of the Magistrate was correct in dismissing this charge. The appeal against this charge is dismissed.

(The rest of the judgment concerns the other two charges).

Appeal Dismissed.

GOMES vs. SUBRAMANIAM.

[App. Civil Juris. (Gordon-Smith, J.A.) Nov. 25, 1940]

Courts Enactment (Cap. 2), section 57, sub sections (i)(b) and (iii) — Landlord and tenant — Jurisdiction of Magistrate's Court — Notice to quit — Waiver.

The respondent was a tenant-at-will, paying no rent, of certain lands of the appellant, held under three titles, upon which was erected a house. The appellant had given the respondent notice to quit the house and on the expiration of the notice instituted in the Magistrate's Court a suit for ejectment in respect of the house only. Subsequently to the filing of the suit the respondent requested the appellant to allow him to occupy the house for a further six months. The appellant agreed and the hearing of the suit was postponed **sine die.** The suit having been restored for hearing the respondent filed his defence in which he pleaded (a) that the Magistrate had no jurisdiction to entertain the suit because the value of the property was in excess of $500; (b) that the notice to quit was bad. The monetary value of the property was clearly in excess of the jurisdiction of the Court and no question of title was raised.

Held, that the question of jurisdiction is governed by sub-section (iii) of section 57 of the Courts Enactment (the amount of rent) and not by sub-section (i) (b) (the value of the property). Sub-sections (i) and (ii) of section 57 have no relation to or bearing on sub-section (iii). As regards the notice to quit, it was neither withdrawn nor waived, but its operation and effect was merely suspended at the request of the defendant. Both defences therefore failed.

Cases referred to :—

(1) *Cheah Leong Keah v. Mydin bin Tamby Bappoo* (1932) M.L.J. 98; (1933) S.S.R. 292.

(2) *Rodd v. Archer* 104 E.R. 595.